

PEQUOT CONSERVATIONIST

MARCH 1967
A Tri-Annual plus
Special Issues
Newsletter
Robert F. Kunz, Editor

CONNECTICUT COLLEGE
LIBRARY
NEW LONDON, CONN.

Published by the
Pequot-sepos Wildlife
Sanctuary, Inc.
Mystic, Connecticut
Tel. 536-9777

DDT DECISION - IMPROVEMENT, BUT DISAPPOINTING

The State of Connecticut Board of Pesticide Control on February 16, 1967 announced its decision concerning DDT use after studying the testimony given at a Public Hearing on December 1, 1966. This public hearing was held as a result of the Resolution of the Pequot-sepos Wildlife Sanctuary submitted to the Board in May 1966 which Resolution, after a page of explanation resolved, "That the Pequot-sepos Wildlife Sanctuary advocates and recommends that the Connecticut State Board of Pesticide Control ban the chemical pesticide DDT for ground application by commercial applicators and by state agencies."

The Hearing was attended by approximately 200 persons, the great majority of which were present in support of the resolution. Twenty testimonies were given in support of the resolution, five in opposition. In addition, letters and telegrams were received by the Board - 149 in support; 4 opposed. One hundred eighteen pages of testimony were given: 97 in support; 21 opposed.

The decision reads as follows:

"The Board of Pesticide Control, in accordance with the provisions of Section 19-300p, Part 1, Chapter 348 of the General Statutes, following a public hearing held December 1, 1966 at Hartford, hereby proposes the following regulations prohibiting the use of DDT by custom pest control operators, as follows:

1. For the control of mosquitos except when authorized by the Commissioner of Health to control vectors of human disease.
2. For the control of insects on shade and forest trees and woody ornamental plants, on non-agricultural land, when foliage is present.

"These regulations will become effective as soon as printed in the Connecticut Law Journal, in the near future.

"The Board also voted to request compliance with the above guidelines by municipalities doing spraying with their own personnel. Assurance has been received from the State Health and Highway Departments that the above rules will be observed in carrying out state spraying programs. The Health Department has a considerable mosquito control program in marshlands while the Highway Department does roadside spraying. However, the Highway Department avoids spraying trees on highway property when requested not to do so by a municipality or by an abutting landowner.

"DDT is not now permitted for any purpose by aerial application except for mosquito control in a human disease emergency by order of the Health Commissioner. No such emergency has occurred since the Board became administratively active on January 1, 1964.

(continued on page 2)

DDT DECISION ... (continued)

"Confining the use of DDT on trees to the period before buds open will avoid damage to most residential and migrating song birds and will furthermore prevent application of DDT during the nesting period for such birds.

"Recommendation No. 5 of the President's Science Advisory Committee on Use of Pesticides called for control of the accretion of residues by orderly reduction in the use of persistent insecticides. That this objective has been effective in Connecticut is obvious as evidenced by the fish study by Dr. Tompkins of the Westboro Wildlife Laboratory in Massachusetts, indicating a decline in environmental contamination of DDT of about 83% from 1963 to 1965. At the Board meeting of May 28, 1965, Dr. Tompkins said that the present levels of DDT and metabolites in the areas studied (Connecticut and Massachusetts), 'are of no measurable significance in direct relation to the living organisms therein.' This obviously results from a widespread drop in the use of this chemical.

"The Board continues to move towards the orderly elimination of the use of DDT.

"The orderly elimination in the use of DDT (and other persistent pesticides) may be defined as replacement by other effective materials of less toxicity to wildlife or of substantially less persistence."

This decision is a small step in the right direction but inadequate and unreflective of the will of the people. Item 1 is commendable and represents the major improvement of this decision. Item 2 although an improvement, ignores the fundamental objection to DDT - its deadly persistence which allows it to build up in the environment, in animal food chains, and to kill years after its last application.

The weakness of the decision to allow continued use of DDT in the open environment, proven over and over again to be destructive to wildlife and the environment in general, is inexcusable, undefendable and unacceptable.

All indications are and studies prove that the osprey is dying as a species in Connecticut. If this decision is allowed to stand, the osprey will continue to be exposed to DDT. The evidence against DDT as a destructive force, uncontrollable in our environment, as a killer of wildlife, as a persistent, insidious and deadly poison, is monumental.

In the above decision, the Board of Pesticide Control refers to a statement of Mr. Tompkins made on May 28, 1965. Let us note here that Mr. Tompkins' statement as quoted by the Board does not say that the 1965 levels of DDT would have no effect on living organisms as the levels multiplied themselves in food chains. Upon reading the Board decision it was our feeling that this brief quote of only thirteen words was misleading and did not convey Mr. Tompkins' true opinions on this matter. In an effort to have this quote clarified we wrote to Mr. Tompkins, who is the Chief Aquatic Biologist of the Division of Fisheries and Game of Massachusetts, with the resultant reply reprinted here in its entirety.

"I read with interest the decision of the Connecticut Board of Pesticide Control relative to your petition regarding the banning of the use of DDT for ground application. Let me reiterate that I am wholeheartedly in favor of such action.

"Our studies in those watersheds mutually shared by Massachusetts and Connecticut did indeed show a decline in DDT residues, as measured in fish tissues, from 1963 to 1965. This was in direct response to the wide spread public clamor over pesticides that followed the publication and publicizing

(continued)

DDT DECISION ... (continued)

of Rachel Carsons' "Silent Spring". In 1965 the amounts of DDT residues present in these areas would have had no direct effect on aquatic organisms.

"In 1966, however, public interest waned and municipalities and commercial applicators began to revert back to the use of DDT. In that year our sampling showed an increase in the residues of this pesticide in our fish samples. Samples analyzed this year show increases up to a magnitude of five fold over last years results. This is of deep concern to me, and if the trend continues we will soon reach the levels reported in 1963.

"Massachusetts is also faced with declining populations of fish-eating birds. This decline cannot be explained by loss of habitat or increased predation. Significantly high levels of DDT and residues have been found in the bodies and eggs of such birds. I am sure that you are aware that the Massachusetts osprey population is at a dangerous low, similar to that of Connecticut, and your indictment of DDT as a causative factor would receive endorsement from most Massachusetts technical and lay personnel interested in the problem.

"Let me congratulate you and your organization on a fine job. I am afraid that the problem must be resolved through regulation rather than education - a not too complimentary commentary on our American public."

In addition, are studies of Clear Lake, in California, from 1950 to 1963 where DDD (a closely related and considered milder pesticide) was used to control gnats. At Clear Lake 1,000 pairs of western grebes were essentially wiped out as a breeding population. This study clearly demonstrates that serious wildlife kills occurred after all detectable levels of this pesticide had disappeared from the water and even from the mud of the lake. In the Clear Lake case a die-off of grebes occurred five years after the last application of DDD. (Ironically, the gnats are back and have developed a degree of immunity against pesticides.)

The Ames Studies on the Osprey prove that the breeding population of Osprey along the Connecticut River in Middlesex and New London Counties, Connecticut, has decreased from about 200 pairs in the early 1940's to 71 pairs in 1960 and 24 pairs in 1963. We believe this study points an undeniable finger at DDT as the primary causative agent in the destruction of the Osprey. In a more recent Ames Study quoted in the Hearing testimony made by Dr. Charles F. Wurster from the Journal of Gynecology, Ames has shown a strong circumstantial relationship between the amount of DDT present in the eggs and their failure to hatch. "A normal, uncontaminated osprey population will produce something like 2.5 young per year. Maybe it is 2.3. In Maryland, they produce something a little under half of that, 1.1 per year, and there the eggs contain 3 parts per million DDT on the average. Here in Connecticut, they contain 5.1 parts per million DDT and they produce 0.5 young per nesting, so you can see a very simple relationship. The higher the amount of DDT, the fewer young that are produced, and I am sure you would have to say -- without any fancy arithmetic -- that under these circumstances this population is going to collapse, and the story is exactly the same for a number of other birds of prey, the most susceptible of which is the bald eagle."

Projecting the collapse of the Osprey indicated by the Ames Study of 31% annually, the Connecticut River population will be reduced to one or two pairs of Osprey by 1968. We submit that the Clear Lake and Ames Studies present undeniable and frightening evidence of the highly measurable significance of DDT and DDD in relation to the living organisms in the environment. It KILLS them!

(continued)

DDT DECISION ... (continued)

As noted above by Dr. Wurster, the Osprey is not alone in its fight for survival against pesticides. The following is a brief review of a pesticide study on the American Bald Eagle - our National Symbol, which appeared as part of an article by Clarence Cottam in BioScience, July 1965.

"Our eagles and hawks

DeWitt et al., Peterson, Rudd, Buchheister, Buckley, and many others have shown the serious delayed effects of America's pesticide programs. Unless the present trends are soon reversed, another decade is likely to see the last of our American emblem, the Bald Eagle, as a nesting species on nearly all of our Atlantic seaboard. It is at the end of a food chain that is being poisoned. During the past 10 years the ration of adult to young bald eagles has decreased from 40 young and 60 adult to 15 young and 85 adult. For the past 2 years, there has been an almost complete failure of nesting pairs from North Carolina to Maine, and a marked decrease over much of this continent.

Of 27 carcasses of eagles tested in 1961-62, all but one, and that a juvenile taken in northern Alaska, showed appreciable levels of DDT and related pesticides in their bodies. Eggs that failed to hatch showed a high level of poison. The osprey shows a similar trend and it, too, is declining alarmingly. Other raptorial birds in England and America also find themselves in trouble because they are at the end of a food chain that is contaminated." When pesticide pollution threatens to destroy even our National Symbol then it is long past time for thorough corrective action.

The Board of Pesticide Control says it is moving toward the orderly elimination of the use of DDT. Our society and the Board can be just as orderly in doing the proper job entirely as by taking baby steps. The difference is the survival of the Osprey, the American Bald Eagle and probably many other species.

It is well at this juncture in these remarks, to point out that the Board of Pesticide Control fails in its decision to present a single reason, valid or otherwise, in defense of the continued use of this pesticide. On the other hand, again from Dr. Wurster's testimony: "The case against DDT is absolutely monumental. I can't keep up with the literature that tells about the destructive effects of DDT primarily on wildlife. I think it is just a matter of time before we learn of the destructive effects on human beings with factors of increased irritability of the nervous system. I think this will happen!"

This decision of the Board will not go unchallenged and must not go unchanged. We urge YOU, those interested in the survival of the Osprey, the American Bald Eagle, a quality environment in Connecticut, your own health and welfare and that of your children, to take your case NOW directly to Governor Dempsey. The monster which is DDT must be imprisoned just as should be any other killer in our society.

The decision really is now in your hands, in the hands of the citizens of Connecticut. If you want this dangerous error corrected - this decision changed - it requires only that you act in force and in sufficient numbers to make the Governor clearly aware of your wishes. Write to Governor John Dempsey, State Capitol, Hartford, Connecticut 06115. A simple letter stating your displeasure is your part in the survival of the Osprey and the preservation of Connecticut Natural Heritage.

The Editor

The Sanctuary wishes to thank the many organizations and individuals, only a few of which are identified in this Newsletter, for their support on this matter. We urge you now to continue your efforts until we rid the State of Connecticut of DDT.

(continued)

DDT DECISION ... (continued)

Because it was impossible in the Newsletter to reproduce the 154-page text of the Public Hearing before the Board of Pesticide Control (a complete transcript of which may be studied at the Trailside Museum, headquarters of the Pequot-sepos Wildlife Sanctuary in Mystic, Connecticut), we have extracted verbatim from the valuable testimony of several of the proponent witnesses as follows:

MR. ROBERT F. KUNZ: "The Board should act to protect the interests of the people of Connecticut when these interests are adversely affected by the use of pesticides in the State; and we believe that the continued use of the biocide DDT is contrary to the best interests and to the wishes of the people of Connecticut."

DR. RICHARD H. PCUGH (by letter): "No more diabolically effective method of destroying wildlife could have been devised than the introduction of fat soluble poisons (such as DDT) into wild plant-animal communities as fat is the basic energy source for most forms of life."

DR. ROGER TORY PETERSON (by letter): "As long as wind blows and water flows we cannot be precise in spot application and roadside spraying of insecticides. There will always be wind drift of sprayed material. Rains wash insecticides into gutters and ditches and the run-off inevitably pollutes our streams and rivers. ... "We are only adding to the contamination of our environment by continued use of DDT and other long-lived persistent chemicals. There is no such thing as a safe dose."

MR. ROLAND C. CLEMENT: "Please notice, gentlemen, that the issue is not simply the survival of one of our most attractive Connecticut birds of prey, the Osprey. The issue is whether or not this Board shall exercise the scientific leadership and the political courage to protect the total Connecticut environment, and the people who live in this environment, from serious contamination by long-lived chemical pesticides. ... "The case of that vanishing Connecticut citizen, the Osprey, is simply one acute and distressing symptom of the environmental contamination we complain about. It is, to all appearances, a result of that tendency of natural ecosystems to pick up, cycle, and concentrate such long-lived, fat-soluble, toxic, synthetic chemical poisons as the persistent chlorinated hydrocarbon pesticides, of which DDT is the most widespread in the environment, and whose deleterious effects are the best documented because it has been studied longer than most." ... "It is the conservationist's claim that the evidence is now of such magnitude ... that the time has come to halt the use of persistent environmental poisons like DDT on a 'reasonable doubt' basis, just as the resolution of the Pequot-sepos Sanctuary group calls for. ... "Barring the use of DDT is such a proper step at this time. Two President's Science Advisory Committees have urged action along these lines, and the Board can demonstrate real leadership only by taking action before the law of the land forces action."

ATTY. RICHARD M. BOWERS: "...I think we are going to have many, many years of history of the Board. I hope the Board goes in, asking the Legislature for certain additional powers, and if you don't ban (DDT), at least you have records to show how much contamination is going on."

"THE CONNECTICUT CHAPTER OF THE NATURE CONSERVANCY hereby goes on record as favoring the banning of custom ground application of DDT by the Connecticut Board of Pesticide Control."

MR. GEORGE W. THORPE: "Due to pesticides, the normal pollination of crops -- especially in Connecticut -- and fruit which was done by other pollinating insects such as the bumble bee and the solitary bee and many other pollinating insects, because of the ill-judged and misplaced use of pesticides, this has practically terminated other pollinating insects, so we are now faced in this country and especially in our fruit crop in Connecticut with importing honey bees to pollinate our fruit crop and other crops such as the cucumber crop and many others. ... "Of course, I am sure this Board is aware that this whole insecticide use has gotten out of hand. It has affected the whole ecology of the State, of our nation. There has been produced such an imbalance in the ecology by the indiscriminate use of them that now we are in a quandry. We don't know where to turn. We did have counteracting elements in entomological elements or bird population. I have seen it myself because I am out in my aviary, and there is a "Silent Spring." Why, there is nowhere near the numbers of birds, and that is indiscriminate use."

(continued)

DDT DECISION ... (Continued)

DR. STEPHEN COLLINS: "When I served as ecologist at the Connecticut Agricultural Experimental Station in New Haven, I had opportunity to see the kills of various kinds of wildlife which die following aerial applications of DDT according to spray procedures recommended or endorsed by that agency. Such kills were seldom publicized. In fact, officialdom always attempts to explain away such incidents as 'accidents.' I am no longer under any obligation to remain silent about such kills and so I am stating as a fact that DDT in aerial sprays has in the past killed Connecticut wildlife and drifted onto pastures where it contaminated grass. Ultimately this contaminated milk so that the farmer who was sprayed could not market it. ... Efficacy in killing the target insect cannot be the sole criterion in the choice of an insecticide, particularly when, like DDT, it persists long after killing the pests. DDT then becomes absorbed into the tissues of living organisms and is concentrated each time a DDT-laden organism is consumed by another. This process of biological magnification has caused sterility and death. It is no longer necessary for me to document this statement for the scientific evidence is overwhelming on this point. Dr. Robert Rudd, eminent scientific author, has presented the evidence in a scholarly manner in his basic text book, Pesticides and the Living Landscape. ... "I realize that three years after this (President's Science Advisory Comm.) recommendation the Connecticut State Board of Pesticide Control finally got around to banning the use of DDT in aerial sprays. This is somewhat surprising because a member of that federal panel also has served on the State Board here. One would have expected prompter action on this matter. ... "If this Board were to ban DDT in custom ground application, there are also available many substitute insecticides of a non-persistent nature. Such insecticides do not linger in the environment long after they are needed. As some of you probably are aware, as little as .5 pounds per acre of DDT is known to last for more than a decade. ... "I would like to remind the Board that the greatest concentration of pesticides occurs not in woodland, not in wetlands, not even in croplands, but in built-up areas. Such lands are the most heavily treated in the entire United States. Custom spraying puts these materials on such lands." ... "A great body of evidence now exists on the hazards of persistent pesticides in our environment. I am puzzled, therefore, to see this Board delay taking action. Let us follow the lead of the federal agencies which have banned DDT, even if we must be late again. ... "The scientific evidence demands that we ban DDT. ... "I expect you will also hear from technicians who apply DDT commercially and who will claim that they 'never see any dead birds' because they are 'using these materials properly.' Studies in Michigan by Wallace, Nickell and Bernard (1961) show a great toll of songbirds from 'approved' shade tree spraying. ... "This whole matter of DDT and its contamination of our environment requires an ecological approach. Yet there is no ecologist on our State Board of Pesticide Control. Nor do I know of a single ecologist in this state or any other state who is regularly consulted by this Board."

MRS. DANIEL McKEON: "It is a well known fact that the use of DDT affects all living things from the micro-organism in the soil to man himself. It is not possible to limit its effect by the usual controls, and therefore its use should be banned completely. ... In conclusion, may we urge you to ban the use of DDT by custom ground pest control operators and State agencies and ultimately ban the further sale and use of all DDT products in Connecticut."

MRS. GLORIA D. POND: "I have come to speak to this distinguished Board because I do not believe any man has the right to contaminate with persistent and deadly poison the soil, water and air of his neighbors in Connecticut and, indeed, around the world. Further, I do not think custom applicators should be allowed to make a profit by so damaging our globe, nor do I think state agencies, in the name of the people of Connecticut, should be permitted to do so. I wish you could extend your resolution to include local governments and agriculturists as well. ... "As a mother, I have been reading the medical literature on pesticides. The California Medical Association has been told by Dr. Malcolm Hargraves of the Mayo Clinic that pesticide poisonings in this country annually are as numerous as traffic deaths, and that many more go undiagnosed. The cumulative effects of repeated small exposures are blamed for causing cancer, aplastic anemia, Hodgkins disease and jaundice by prominent medical experts. At the Mayo Clinic, leukemia has been repeatedly diagnosed as proceeding from DDT exposure, and cases of a single exposure suffered during custom application of elm spray have been published. ... "In my town, officials have reconsidered their annual elm spray

(continued)

DDT DECISION ... (continued)

policy in favor of a systemic chemical, despite assurance from State Agriculture officials that DDT hazards are slight. They did it at the request of concerned citizens, and at the overwhelming evidence that sprayed elms continue to die. ... "But last spring a friend called me in great distress. Her neighbors had engaged custom applicators to spray elms on their private property, and she reported seeing a fog of the poison material drifting over her lawn and her children's toys. She asked the spray truck operator about protection from the poison and was told 'that's okay lady, it won't hurt you. It's only DDT.' She burned those yard toys -- and unwittingly released the DDT in smoke to menace others in our air shed. My friend had no way to protect herself from the insidious trespass of deadly poison into her yard and ultimately into her children's bodies. We citizens look to this Board for that protection."

MR. WALTER CZAJA: "The Connecticut State League of Sportsmen and Conservation Clubs wishes to go on record as supporting the resolution supported by the Pequot-sepos Wildlife Sanctuary... .. "Being a sportsman, I have observed not only a decline in the Osprey, as outlined here previously, but for some reason we have seen a decline in the appearance of the bald eagle, golden eagle, and other birds of prey. ... In regard to the woodcock -- which many sportsmen, including myself, consider one of the most sporting birds of its kind in the country -- particularly after Rachel Carson wrote her book, the standard practice was to give the birds you shot away to someone you didn't like because you weren't interested in being poisoned with DDT. ... Finally, we as sportsmen eat these same fish, species of fish, in many instances that are eaten by these birds of prey. We all know all of this does contain residues of DDT. Until we as a society know that DDT or any other potent insecticides are known to be non-harmful in any way, they should be totally banned from our environment."

MR. JOHN M. ANDERSON: "For the sake of brevity, I will merely state at this time that conclusions reached through independent approaches to the problem show conclusively several species of fish, crustaceans, birds, invertebrate forms were either completely eliminated from our control area or adversely affected. Four years after we applied our spray at the rate of two-tenths of one pound per acre -- which is the same rate used on farms in nearby areas -- we find we are still killing these same organisms, that DDT is being concentrated in several important food fishes to a level which we feel is hazardous to human health. The conclusion is inescapable, that the potential hazards of DDT in an aquatic environment far outweigh any real or potential benefit through the control of insects. Since we are dealing with exactly the same species in Connecticut, these findings would be applicable to our State. I, therefore, urge the Board on the adoption of this proposal."

MR. GORDON LOERY: "DDT is a non-selective, persistent biocide. It kills far more than the target pest at which it is directed. It accumulates in soil, water and biological food chains producing sterility if not death for years after it has been applied. Three years ago the President's Science Advisory Committee recommended eliminating the use of such persistent toxic pesticides. It is now time Connecticut accepted this recommendation. ... "Three years ago in a letter to the Hartford Courant I called attention to this (ecological) lack of balance in the membership of the Board. As I pointed out then, "When the idea for such a review board was first suggested to the Governor by a private citizens organization, it was specifically stated this should be a 'non-partisan commission' and that none of its members should be 'representatives of the public agencies or commercial interests concerned'. In other words, those responsible for creating the pesticide status quo should not sit in judgement of their own policies and practices. The Board appointed by the Governor fails to meet this standard. None of the private conservation organizations in the State that have expressed concern about this problem are represented." It now appears that my concern of three years ago was justified."

DR. FRANK EGLER (by letter): "I wish to put on public record my complete professional and scientific support for this resolution, and to urge the Connecticut Board of Pesticide Control to take such action as will accept, implement, and effect such matters. ... "In my opinion, and from the viewpoint of the quality of our total environment, the scientific situation is overwhelmingly in support of the resolution being heard today."

(continued)

DDT DECISION ... (continued)

MR. RICHARD SODERSTROM: "I wish also to mention the fact ..that Federal bills have been introduced regarding the complete abandonment of the manufacture and distribution of DDT in the United States .. that this has been introduced into the Congressional Record of July 12th, 1966 by Senator Gaylord Nelson of Wisconsin. It is Senate Bill S-3608."

DR. RICHARD H. GOODWIN: "...a rather unpleasant report .. was in the New York Times -- you can't always believe what is in the 'paper, but this was a report of a scientific finding that infants analyzed for DDT content were found to have a fairly high concentration, and it leaves the gnawing, uncomfortable feeling that in those weeks when the embryonic members of our species are developing, there may be some unpleasant effects of these compounds in the formative periods of growth. ... "In the past years various government agencies, including the U.S.D.A. and the U.S. Forest Service, have used DDT extensively and have recommended its use. Despite established practice, and the loss of face involved in reversing policy, these agencies have abandoned or drastically reduced the use of this compound. I believe the State of Connecticut should ban the use of this compound. ... "Secretary Stewart L. Udall in answer to the question, 'can we afford to use these persistent toxic chemicals if we cannot control the movement of their residues after use?' recently stated, 'From my point of view, the answer is an unequivocal 'No.'"

DR. WILLIAM A. NIERING: "'Man's environment is the whole natural scene, the earth with its soil, its plants, and its animals. In many places these have reached a natural balance which man disturbs at his peril.' These warning words of Charles Darwin are especially appropriate in relation to our present pesticide problem. ... Five years after spraying, the DDD, that is a chemical similar but reportedly much less harmful to fishes than DDT, was found built up in amazing quantities in the animal life at Clear Lake. Plankton, the microscopic life of the water, accumulated 250 times the concentration of pesticide sprayed on the bothersome insects; frogs carried 2000 times more; and sunfish, the food of the grebes, contained 12,000 times the concentration of the chemical originally sprayed. Here is a real peril to the natural balance. ... It is highly significant that on Long Island within the last year a Suffolk County Supreme Court Justice issued a restraining order against the use of DDT on the basis that its use is injurious to the County and its residents. ... Secretary Udall has ruled that DDT can no longer be used on lands under the jurisdiction of the Department of the Interior. The President's Science Advisory Committee has also recommended that the use of DDT and other chlorinated hydrocarbons be discontinued."

DR. CHARLES F. WURSTER, JR.: "First of all, on Dutch Elm disease I think it is important for you to realize that the best records for the control of Dutch Elm disease is not by the use of DDT. The best published record for the control of Dutch Elm disease is in the State of New York by a number of cities, and it was done before DDT was .. in regular use as a pesticide. Back in the '30s and '40s, sanitation was the primary means of control in New York State and was highly successful. The present practice in general in most places is to either spray alone or practice sanitation plus spraying. What really counts in the control of the Dutch Elm disease is not spraying, but sanitation. Spraying will help some. If you spray alone, you will eventually lose your trees, although not as fast as you would if you do nothing. If you practice sanitation, you can save your trees. I say that because as I go on with the rest of another story, I want you to realize by spraying with DDT, you are not really solving the Dutch Elm Disease problem at all. ... (After the spraying) we got a tree swallow, a bird which feeds on insects that are flying. We were supposed to be spraying to kill insects, but they were getting a sub-lethal dose from it, but which was lethal to the bird. ... During the first of June, 'Silent Spring' had arrived in Hanover, New Hampshire. The place was absolutely empty. You didn't have to conduct a survey to see something. You could walk for blocks in a perfect habitat for robins and see almost nothing. Then during the summer, the population perked up due to influxes of birds from the outside. Birds will come into a disaster area so you can continue to inflict mortality within a given area and birds will come in from the outside. That is why you will continue to see birds on your lawns, even though you might be killing them steadily. ... "It seems to me, therefore, that your choice is twofold: You can either ban DDT now and all the way, or you will ban DDT later when everyone else has to do so, so I don't think you have another choice. DDT is finished. It is on its way out."

(continued)

DDT DECISION ... (continued)

DR. GEORGE M. WOODWELL: "I have been for a number of years very much interested in a variety of pollution problems, including radioactivity and pesticides, DDT in particular, and I have done some research on the distribution of DDT in the environment, and I am actively involved in some at the moment with Dr. Wurster. ... DDT is now found almost wherever one looks for it. We can pick up birds in Great South Bay and predict the level of DDT we will find there within an order of magnitude. We can look in the Antarctic in top carnivores, or even intermediate carnivores and find residues of DDT in places hundreds of miles from any place where DDT could have been applied. ... Now it seems to me that the fact that it is widely distributed over the surface of the earth is in itself sufficient reason for very serious concern. ... My conclusion personally is that we should stop using DDT in any situation where it can contaminate the biological, geographical and chemical cycles of the earth."

MISS LILLIAN JUDD: "I came prepared with artillery fire, but instead of using artillery, I will say that our (Waterbury Naturalists) Club endorses the resolution of the Pequot-sepos Wildlife Sanctuary."

ATTY. VICTOR J. YANNAcone, JR.: "An acre of good bottom land can produce over the course of a regular harvest 300 pounds of shellfish material. ... We now have the problem of feeding many, many people in the world as well as ourselves. We have this ready resource. When we talk about things like parts per million, many of us are laymen and don't recognize the full meaning of this. Try to visualize one part of Vermouth, a jigger of Vermouth in one tank-car of gin. It makes a very dry Martini, and one part per billion is that jigger of Vermouth in a thousand tank-cars of gin, which is an even drier Martini. We know that DDT in concentrations as small as parts per billion can affect shellfish. Generally, the opinion is this effect is bad. ... It is no longer a matter of deciding whether or not more DDT should be loosed into the environment. It is a matter of who has the power to act quickly to stop the ejection of this environmental contaminant into the atmosphere -- I mean biosphere."

LEGAL ASPECTS OF THE DDT DECISION

The faulty and incorrect legal approach of the Connecticut Board of Pesticide Control has shown once again in the conduct of the Board's December 1st Hearing in Hartford on the banning of DDT and in the decision of February 16th. Since its beginning, the Board seems to have considered that its primary function was to protect pesticide users from pressures of the general public for protection to wildlife and for protection to our own health.

The legislation creating our State Board of Pesticide Control specifically "stacks the cards" in favor of pesticide users by requiring the membership to represent special interests such as agriculture. Is it any wonder that the Board's history is thus one of protecting pesticide interests rather than protecting the general public?

The recent United States Court of Appeals decision reversing the granting of a permit to Con Edison at Mt. Storm King in New York sets a level of public protection which could be and should be used as a guide by Connecticut administrative agencies charged with a duty to protect the public. In that case the federal agency's decision was reversed because the agency on its own had not sought out information to properly evaluate the interest of all citizens. Rather the federal agency (as did our Board of Pesticide Control) sat back and placed the burden upon the public to hire experts, etc. to try to protect themselves.

It is time for a change in the law setting up the Pesticide Board, in the legal procedures used by Connecticut administrative bodies and in the attitudes of our lawmakers including the executive as well as the legislative. It is time for the public to get a "fair shake"

(continued)

DDT - LEGAL ... (continued)

The decision of February 16th shows clearly that the outmoded philosophy of the Board is to regulate pesticides only when overwhelming evidence shows great harm has occurred. Rather the Board can and should under our Connecticut law take the public protective position of allowing use of persistent pesticides such as DDT only when some clear public value will be assisted. It was interesting to note that the pro-DDT speakers at the December 1st Hearing were those whose interest in the use of DDT was commercial. There were no members of the general public urging the use of DDT because of public benefits. When dealing with a known killer of the potency of DDT the public should have the benefit of the doubt not the commercial spray applicators who certainly can find other methods. This environment is the only one which we and our children have to occupy.

Our law deals with and operates by words and when meanings are ignored or warped, law loses its effectiveness. The Pesticide Board decision allowing DDT spraying before the leaves appear on trees and then rationalizing this by saying later in the decision that thus song birds and nesting birds will be protected, ignores or warps what probably is the most horrible aspect of DDT which is its persistence. The persistence of DDT is well documented in our scientific literature as remaining in the environment for many, many years. To imply that after a short period of time safety will occur illustrates a warping or ignoring of the persistence concept by the Board members who capsule persistence into a time scale of a few weeks or months for which there is no justification in any scientific literature.

Atty. Richard M. Bowers

(Editor's Note: The above article is reprinted from "The Nature Conservancy - Connecticut Chapter Newsletter" of February, 1967.)

Any material published in the "Pequot Conservationist" may be reprinted without permission; credit would be appreciated. Ed.

Pequot-sepos Wildlife Sanctuary, Inc.

Mystic, Connecticut 06355

Non-Profit Org. U. S. Postage P A I D Mystic, Conn. Permit No. 37

Miss Hazel A. Johnson
Connecticut College Library
New London
Connecticut 06320